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- Yet, for pooling the results of multiple studies (e.g., meta analysis), there remains significant discretion and uncertainty.
  - What is the universe of studies?
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Some framework for specifying and validating ex-ante predictions about heterogeneous effects may be helpful.

Despite difficulties, it seems critical to explore whether channels that link intervention to outcome are operative in different contexts.
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The Experiments in Governance and Politics (EGAP) network is running a three-year, $1.8M regranting window, housed at Berkeley’s Center on the Politics of Development.

- Objective: to pilot a model for experimental research that may address some of these challenges

- Thematic focus on citizen engagement in electoral processes.

- The RFP will go out soon. Co-PIs on regranting initiative are Craig McIntosh (UCSD), Susan Hyde (Yale), and Guy Grossman (U. of Pennsylvania).
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1. Fosters cumulation. Group proposals (or grouped individual proposals) will address similar questions, introduce variation in treatments in systematic fashion, and coordinate outcome measures.

2. Improves synthetic analysis. Pre-registration of groups of studies defines the universe of comparisons.

3. Helps understand what works where and why. Case selection, and theory about why and where we should see heterogeneous effects, is a critical part of proposals; we want to validate these predictions and assess when key channels are operative.

Getting researcher incentives right seems critical.
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